

### **REMARKS**

Claims 24-33, 47 and 56-68 remain pending in the application.

#### **Title Objection**

The title was objected to as alleged being non-descriptive. The title is amended herein to be more descriptive. The Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

#### **Claims 24-29, 31, 47 and 56-68 over Matsuda in view of Olkin**

In the Office Action, claims 24-29, 31, 47 and 56-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133573 to Matsuda et al. ("Matsuda") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,310,892 to Olkin ("Olkin"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 24-29, 31, 47 and 56-68 recite a connectionless transport protocol that is comprised of a **transport layer** that corresponds substantially to a transport layer of an Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) model, the transport layer providing for networking services comprising **message duplication detection**.

The Examiner alleges for Matsuda that "if a NOA client can utilize the services of another NOA client, then it is **inherent** that they are connected to one another". (see Office Action, page 3) Further, the Examiner alleges that Olkin's disclosure "**inherently** encompasses OSI transport layer". (see Office Action, page 5) "That which may be inherent is not necessarily known. Obviousness cannot be predicated on what is unknown." In re Spormann, 363 F.2d 444, 448, 150 USPQ 449, 452 (CCPA 1966). Such a retrospective view of inherency is not a substitute for some teaching or suggestion supporting an obviousness rejection. See In re Newell, 891 F.2d 899, 901, 13 USPQ2d 1248, 1250 (Fed.Cir.1989). Thus, the Examiner's reliance on **inherent** features within either Matsuda or Olkin, much less both, is **improper**. The Applicants

respectfully request that the rejection of claims 24-29, 31, 47 and 56-68 be withdrawn based on its improper reliance on inherency.

The Examiner acknowledged that "Matsuda does not specifically disclose the transport protocol is a connectionless transport protocol used to allow said plurality of servers to communicate with one another and to provide networking services comprising message segmentation and reassembly, message duplication detection." (see Office Action, page 4) The Examiner relies on Olkin to alleged make up for the deficiencies in Matsuda. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner relies on Olkin at col. 6, lines 11-26 to allegedly disclose the claimed message duplication detection. However, Olkin at col. 6, lines 11-26 discloses:

Although the connectionless protocol of the present invention does not require opening and closing a connection, the destination node initializes local state information upon receipt of the first segment of the message. The local state information allows the destination node to track subsequent segments of the message, even if segments arrive out of order, to re-construct that message. However, the local state information is discarded after [it] has been successfully received and reconstructed. In one embodiment, the local state information is received to prevent the receipt of duplicate segments as being interpreted as part of a new message. However, the amount of time that the local state information is retained by the destination node is completely independent of the action that the source node takes following the completion of the sending of the message.

Olkin's invention is a transport layer of a connectionless protocol that provides for packet segmentation and re-construction (see Abstract) – NOT message duplication detection. Olkin's detection of "receipt of duplicate segments" is performed by the "destination node [that] initializes local state information" – not a transport layer of a connectionless protocol, as claimed. Olkin at col. 6, lines 11-26 fails to even mention the use of a transport layer. Thus, Olkin fails to disclose a connectionless transport protocol that is comprised of a transport layer that corresponds substantially to a transport layer of an Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) model, the transport layer providing for

networking services comprising **message duplication detection**, as recited by claims 24-29, 31, 47 and 56-68.

Matsuda and Olkin, either alone or in combination, would still fail to disclose, teach, or suggest a **connectionless transport protocol** that is comprised of a **transport layer** that corresponds substantially to a transport layer of an Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) model, the transport layer providing for networking services comprising **message duplication detection**, as recited by claims 24-29, 31, 47 and 56-68.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 24-29, 31, 47 and 56-68 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Claims 30, 32 and 33 over Matsuda in view of Olkin and Bell**

In the Office Action, claims 30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Matsuda in view of Olkin, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,081 to Bell et al. ("Bell"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 30, 32 and 33 are dependent on claim 24, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 24.

Claims 30, 32 and 33 recite, *inter alia*, a connectionless transport protocol that is comprised of a **transport layer** that corresponds substantially to a transport layer of an Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) model, the transport layer providing for networking services comprising **message duplication detection**. As discussed above, Matsuda and Olkin, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest such features.

Bell is relied on to allegedly disclose if a new message sequence number is received before the necessary last segment of the previous message, to abort processing and return an error; and encapsulating a communication layer (see Office Action, page 9). Thus, even considering Bell's alleged disclosure, Matsuda, Olkin, and Bell, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a **connectionless transport protocol** that is comprised

of a transport layer that corresponds substantially to a transport layer of an Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) model, the transport layer providing for networking services comprising message duplication detection, as recited by claims 30, 32 and 33.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 30, 32 and 33 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Handwritten signature of William H. Bollman, with the text "Dan JEP (#46,504) for" written above it.

William H. Bollman  
Reg. No.: 36,457  
Tel. (202) 261-1020  
Fax. (202) 887-0336

**MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC**  
2000 M Street, NW 7<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20036-3307  
TEL. (202) 261-1020  
FAX. (202) 887-0336  
WHB/df